



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Book Notices.

DALMAN'S ARAMAIC-MODERN HEBREW DICTIONARY.¹

The material contained in this glossary falls into two parts: *a*) Targum, *b*) Talmud and Midrash. For the first part the author has made use of oriental MSS., whose superlinear vocalization he transcribed into the so-called Teberian system. Of the accuracy of this part of the work only those are able to judge who have access to the MSS. Assuming that this part of the work has been conscientiously performed, the author deserves the thanks of the student for his laborious task.

The other part of the work, however, leaves much to be desired. This work is intended, primarily, as a handbook for students to whom the large works of Levy and Jastrow are inaccessible. In order that it should answer its purpose, three conditions are essential: a scientific arrangement of the material uniformly carried out, completeness of vocabulary, consistency and accuracy of vocalization. Unfortunately, all these conditions are lacking.

The arrangement is, like that of Jastrow, purely alphabetical, with this difference: that the *matres lectionis* are disregarded. It cannot be said that this is very satisfactory. The only scientific arrangement for a Semitic dictionary is that according to roots. For practical purposes Gesenius' *Handwörterbuch* has proven to be the best. Even in the author's arrangement many inconsistencies appear. Thus he has many words in two different places: **אֲבִירָה**, 6*a*, 8*a*; **אֲוִיָּה**, 9*a*, 11*a*; **אֲוִין**, 9*a*, 11*b*; **אֲוִדָּהָה**, 9*a*, 12*a*; **אֲוִין**, 15*b*, 23*b*; **בֹּקֶר**, 48*b*, 60*a*, etc., while **אִיכָה**, with radical **י**, is spelled **אִכָּה** and given on 16*a* instead of 15*b*. The *matres lectionis* denoting short vowels are sometimes retained, as in **אִיבֹרֶר**, sometimes omitted, as in **וִוִּרֶר**, without any consistency.

A considerable part of the vocabulary, mostly words of uncertain etymology and meaning, just such words as the student is most apt to consult the dictionary, are omitted, while one word of modern Hebrew, **בְּחִינָה**, has been inserted!

In the definition of words and in their vocalization the author naturally mostly follows his predecessors, but in some cases ventures to depart from them. We are unable to judge most of these departures,

¹ **עִירֵי הַדָּרָשׁ**. ARAMÄISCH-NEUHEBRÄISCHES WÖRTERBUCH ZU TARGUM, TALMUD UND MIDRASCH. Mit Vokalisation der targumischen Wörter nach südarabischen Handschriften und besonderer Bezeichnung des Wortschatzes des Onkelostargum. Unter Mitwirkung von P. Theodor Schärf, bearbeitet von Dr. Gustaf H. Dalman. Teil I, (א-י). Mit Lexicon der Abbraviaturen von G. H. Händler. Frankfurt a. M.: J. Kauffmann, 1897. Pp. x (+ ii) + 180 (+ 1) + 129; 8vo. Complete, M. 12.

for the reason that no references are added. His departure in vocalization rests on personal combination. The reasons for such departures the author should have given in one of the current journals. Some of them may prove tenable; others are certainly insupportable. Every Aramaic word is given in the emphatic state, whether it occurs so or not. Thus **אומדוחא**, **אינישא**, **אנחוחא**, never occur in this form. Still, such forms are at least possible. But when **ברקתי** is given as **ברקתיחא**, the possibility of its correctness is at least doubtful (§ 987);² that the masculine **ריצא** is given as **ריצתא** is certainly wrong. The vocalization as a whole is not only full of inexcusable inconsistencies, as when, for example, one and the same grammatical form is vocalized in *four* different ways (*cf.* **הקם**, **הרה**, **הפר**, **הכן**, **הקר**, **הנץ**, **הנק**), but must be characterized as slovenly when even biblical words are misspelled. *Cf.* **גחלים**, **בריה**, **אשמורה**, **ארצו**, **אספות**, **באחרונה**, **גחלים**, **בריה**, **אשמורה**, **ארצו**, **אספות**, **באחרונה**.

In the following lines I shall point out mostly incorrectness and inconsistency of vocalization, without intending to be exhaustive. In order not to repeat myself, I refer for more explanation, where necessary, to my grammar of Babylonian Aramaic. For **רבתי** (*s. v.* **אבל**) read **רבתי**. **אבל** seems to be but the superlinear form of **אבלא**, and is to be stricken out. **אבנתא**, *r.* **אבנתא** (§ 861). **אד**, *r.* **אדן**.

אד, or **אד**. **אודא**, *r.* **אודא** = **אודא**. The reason for the vocalization of **אודא** is not apparent (§ 865). **אודתא** is the same as **אודתא**. For **אדיר** *r.* **אדיר**. **אוכיפי** is probably **אוכיפי** = ***אוכפית** with diphthongization (§ 80). **אומנא**, *r.* **אומנא**. **אופיכיה** is perhaps **אופיכיה** = **מִהֶפְכָּה**, an Aph'el noun. **אופנא**, *r.* **אופנא**. **אורא**, *r.* **אורא**. **אורא** is not Pa'el (§ 859). On **אוד** *cf.* § 31, n. 3. **אודבוי**, *r.* **אודבוי**. **אודריתי** is probably a Babylonian word and should be vocalized **אודריתי** and **אודריתי** = **אודריתי** (§ 961). **אודרפניא**, *r.* **אודרפניא**. **אטבא**, *r.* **אטבא**. **אטו**, read with tradition **אטו**. As the etymology of the word is unknown, there is no reason to change the vocalization. **אטיפא** and **אטיפא**, *r.* **אטיפא** and **אטיפא**; *cf.* **אטיפא** in Harkavy's edition of *loc. cit.* **אכרנא**, *r.* **אכרנא** (§ 821). **אליהוק**, *cf.* Epstein, *REJ.*, XXVIII, 88. **אלנקי**, *r.* **אלנקי**. **שוחקות** (*sub* **אמה**), *r.* **שוחקות**. **אמוראה**, *r.* **אמוראה**; the same *sub voce* **אמוראה** is identical with **חמיתא**, but both are differentiated by the author. **אמפותיחא**: such a word does not exist; *r.* **אמכותי**, whatever that may mean. **אמקא**, read with Syriac and Jewish tradition **אמקא**. For **אמתי** *r.*

² These §§ refer to the reviewer's *Grammar of the Aramaic Idiom*, etc.

אֲמַתִּי (§ 1004*h*). אֲנִי is theoretically correct. But language does not always run in consonance with *a priori* theories. The undisputed traditional pronunciation is אָנִי. If asked to explain this form, I should say that it might have been influenced by such a nominal form as אָהִי, while אֲנִי was considered to be a form like פָּרִי. The suffixal form in such words as עֲמִנִי, etc., might have also been a factor in its vocalization. אֲנַטְרָדוּס with three consecutive שְׁוָאִים! אֲנַטְרָדוּס, r. אֲנַטְרָדוּס. אֲנַקְיָה, 25*b*, r. אֲנִי. Why אֲנַקְיָה with פֿ and אֲנַטְרָדוּס with פֿ? For מֵאֲבִיקוֹת (s. v. אֲנִי), r. מֵאֲבִיקוֹת. For אֲכַפְּתָה we expect אֲכַפְּתָה, for אֲכַפְּתָה rather אֲכַפְּתָה. On אֲכַרְיָה cf. § 952. For אֲפָא restore אֲפָא (§ 801). For אִיֶּסֶק r. אִיֶּסֶק. For אֲפִתָּה r. אֲפִתָּה or אֲפִתָּה = פִּתָּה (§ 798). For אֲקִרְקָתָה r. אֲקִרְקָתָה = אֲקִרְקָתָה. For אֲרִבְלִי, אֲרִבְלִי, r. אֲרִבְלִי, אֲרִבְלִי. For אֲרָא r. אֲרָא III, vocalize אֲרָא (§ 855). For אֲרִכְתָּה r. אֲרִכְתָּה or אֲרִכְתָּה, Aph'el noun of אֲרָךְ to permit. For אֲרִמְיָה r. אֲרִמְיָה. On אֲתַמְרָה cf. § 104. For בִּגְבִיב r. בִּגְבִיב. The name occurs in the Aramaic inscriptions as בגבנא and means of *generous proportions*. בָּהֶם, more probably בָּהֶם. בּוּטְטָה, r. בּוּטְטָה (§ 858). בּוּרִית: on the meaning of this word cf. Friedman, השלח III, 201. בּוּתָה, r. בּוּתָה (§ 798). בְּחִירָתָה, as name of the treatise עֲדִיּוֹת, must be vocalized בְּחִירָתָה. בְּטִיטָה, בְּטִיטָה, are more probably בְּטִיטָה (§ 866). The various spellings of בִּיכָה point to the form בִּיכָה. For בִּינְתָה II, r. בִּנְתָה (§ 809). For בִּיתוֹת r. בִּיתוֹת. The spelling בִּיאַתוֹת occurring half a dozen times allows no other vocalization. Wonder what the author thought of the singular of a form בִּיתוֹת! For קֶאֱמֵר (s. v. בֶּעָא I) r. קֶאֱמֵר. For בִּצְבִיץ r. בִּצְבִיץ. For בִּצְיָתָה r. בּוּצְיָתָה, cf. Fränkel, *Aram. Fremdw.*, 217. For בִּקְתָה, r. בִּקְתָה, r. בִּקְתָה. For בִּרְךָ r. בִּרְךָ. For בִּרְתוֹתָה r. בִּרְתוֹתָה. For בִּתְ I, 4, should have been given a separate article and vocalized בִּתְ. It is an abbreviation of בִּתְרִי. The full expression בבִּתְרִיא occurs in חֲרַבָּא דְּמִשְׁה ed. Gaster. Cf. also Löw, *ZDMG.*, LII, 315. On בּוּרָה, cf. § 798, note. For בּוּלְמִי r. בּוּלְמִי. A form בּוּר cannot give a construct state בּוּר. For בּוּרְתָה r. בּוּרְתָה. For בִּסְטְרוֹן r. בִּסְטְרוֹן. The article הִבְרָתָה II is to be stricken out; *pestilence* is מוֹתָנָה (§ 797). For הִוְשָׁה restore הִוְשָׁה (§ 795). הִוְשָׁה, r. הִוְשָׁה. For קֶצְרָה (s. v. דִּעַת) restore קֶצְרָה. Difference of vocalization between masc. and fem. occurs also elsewhere. Cf. קֶטְוִן and קֶטְוָה. For דִּקְתָה, r. דִּקְתָה. For רְצוּצָה (s. v. רְצוּצָה), r. רְצוּצָה.

The word is an abbreviation of **וְרִצְיָא**; cf. Syr. ܪܝܨܐ (Audo, s. v. ܪܝܨܐ) and § 975. **הַסִּבָּה**, the spelling **הַסִּבָּה** and traditional pronunciation require **הַסִּבָּה**. That analogical forms retain their first vowel unchanged proves nothing for this word. **הַנִּצֵּל**, C. MS. vocalizes **הַנִּצֵּל**, i. e., **הַנִּצֵּל**. For **שְׁטִתְיָה** (s. v. **חֶלֶם**) r. **שְׁטִתְיָה**. The renderings of **הַלְזוֹן**, **הַלְזוֹנָא**, are rather inadequate. The word denotes among other things five different animals. Cf. Epstein, *Beth Talmūd*, V, 299 sqq. **הַרְטוֹם** II is more probably **הַרְטוֹם**. On **יֵזֶן** cf. § 80. For **יֵנָא** r. **יֵנָא**. For **יֵרֵנָא** r. **יֵרֵנָא** (§ 849).

In the present state of our knowledge absolute correctness cannot be expected of such a work as this. But accuracy and consistency the author owes to his readers. Let us hope that the second part will be issued in a more correct form.

C. LEVIAS.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE.

ARYO-SEMITIC PHILOLOGY.¹

Three causes lie at the basis of the attempts constantly being made to find elements of community between the two great families of language spoken by peoples which have dominated the literature and life of civilized man: first, the ineradicable feeling of the unity of mankind and therefore of the various languages spoken by man; second, the constantly increasing body of facts testifying to primitive historical relations between Aryan and Semitic peoples; third, the passion of the professional philologist for discovering, or inventing, linguistic affinities between languages hitherto regarded as distinct. The two former causes are reasonable, and the impulses to which they give rise quite comprehensible. As for the latter, one must discriminate, or run the risk of falling into the clutches of the philological "crank" whose grist of derivations, combinations, and analogies is so amazing, bewildering, and captivating that he who came to scoff may be forced to remain to pray for mercy or deliverance.

An especially happy hunting ground of this character is the language and literature of Greek mythology, in which Mr. Robert Brown, Jr., has been a diligent and delighted sportsman. The narrative of his adventures, the bags he has potted, the scalps he has taken, the happy way in which he has brought down game which Professor F. Max Müller has missed, and the strong indignation he manifests at the unnecessary mutilations caused by the clumsy shooting of Mr. Andrew Lang, in a field where he has been for some time lawlessly poaching—all this, and more, is set down in this book, in language which suggests the good old

¹ SEMITIC INFLUENCE IN HELLENIC MYTHOLOGY: with special reference to the recent mythological works of the Rt. Hon. Professor F. Max Müller and Mr. Andrew Lang. By Robert Brown, Jr., F. S. A., M. R. A. S. London: *Williams & Norgate*; New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. xvi + 228 pp. \$2.50, net.